

**Draft Summary of Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)  
October 25, 2001**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting on October 25, 2001 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 4	Interim Recreation Projects Task Force Recommendations to the Recreation & Socioeconomics Work Group
Attachment 5	Recreation and Socioeconomics Study Plans Preliminary Schedule
Attachment 6	Preliminary Draft Proposed Recreation and Socioeconomic Studies

### **Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

The Facilitator announced there was an error on page 4 of the most recent issue of the Oroville Facilities Relicensing Newsletter, dated September 2001. The last sentence of the second paragraph reads, "...Californians used on average 6.84 kWh of energy per household during 2000." The correct number is actually 6,840 kWh per household.

### **Action Items – August 23, 2001 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting**

A summary of the August 23, 2001 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

<b>Action Item #R30:</b>	Review information lists and send additional information to DWR.
Status:	Doug Rischbieter reported that he has been assembling this information but has only received information from Harry Williamson and Patricia Watters. Doug stated that he would continue to accept information submissions.
<b>Action Item #R31:</b>	Insert issues addressed by issue statement to each issue sheet.
Status:	The Facilitator reported that the issue sheets are currently being used to develop study plans, and that the issues are documented in the issue statements.
<b>Action Item #R32:</b>	Discuss Issue Statement S2 with Mike Kelley, Butte County and JPA representatives to determine the fate of this Issue Statement.
Status:	Dale Hoffman-Floerke provided background on the August 23 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group meeting when the group discussed whether or not S2 should remain on the list of Issue Statements. Dale reminded the participants that several of them felt that the issues described in Issue Statement S2 were outside the scope of the relicensing process and should not be considered in this forum but that S2 had not been removed from the Issue Statements at that previous meeting

because Mike Kelley was not present. Dale stated that no one from DWR staff or the consulting team has had the opportunity to speak to Mike since the last meeting as this Action Item suggested.

Mike Kelley stated that he had received a letter signed by the Deputy Director of DWR; he submitted a copy of the letter to the Facilitator. Both Mike Kelley and Mike Pierce, representing Butte County stated that they did not want Issue Statement S2 removed from the proposed list and would appreciate a meeting. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to carry this action item over to the next meeting.

**Action Item #R33:** Prepare draft language to address coordination between LM3 and R5.  
**Status:** Doug Rischbieter reported that he had spoken with the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group about coordination of LM3 and R5. A report on the coordination effort with all of the work groups is included in this meeting.

**Action Item #R34:** Insert excerpt from FERC document Recreation Development at Licensed Hydroelectric Projects in summary notes.  
**Status:** The Facilitator reported that the document was included in the meeting summary and is available on the relicensing web site.

**Action Item #R35:** Consolidate existing information and information needs and begin developing list of study plans.  
**Status:** Doug Rischbieter reported that the Study Plan Development Task Force has undertaken this effort. A report on the their efforts is included in this meeting.

### **Interim Projects Task Force Recommendation**

Dale Hoffman-Floerke summarized DWR's decision to consider Interim Projects, the creation of the Interim Projects Task Force and their activities over the past ten months, and the process they utilized to prioritize and consolidate projects to develop a final list of recommendations for the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group's consideration.

The Facilitator acknowledged that the Task Force went above and beyond their charge to put together simply a list of projects and included a one or two sentence project description and preliminary cost estimates in their recommendation. She asked that the Task Force members be commended for the time and effort that they put into developing these recommendations. She informed the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group that they would be asked to consider the list and forward their recommendations on to the Plenary Group. A final recommendation to DWR on the Interim Projects list will be requested from the Plenary Group at their December 11 meeting.

Steve Nachtman distributed the Interim Recreation Projects Task Force Recommendations to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group document. The recommendations are appended to this summary as Attachment 4. He explained that this is still a working document and is based on the draft that was passed out at the May 24 meeting of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group. He stressed that much more information would be needed on each project prior to implementation. He reminded the group that the cost figures are extremely gross estimates and do not include the cost of operations and maintenance, environmental review, etc.

Tom Glover briefly described the 14 projects in "Group A" of the Recommended Interim Recreation Projects List. One participant asked how many of the projects would require studies. Tom responded that the Task Force was charged with coming up with a list; the next steps will include considering what additional information is required.

DC Jones briefly described the nine projects recommended in "Group B". Steve Nachtman assured the group that while the Feather River Enhancement Project/River Bend Park came out number one on the Interim Projects list, it doesn't appear on the Group A or Group B list because it

is being considered separately from the list of Interim Projects. He added that negotiations are underway within the Plenary Group for the Interim Settlement Agreement that includes River Bend Park.

Craig Jones outlined the "Potential Phase II Interim Projects". He explained that the Task Force felt these projects would benefit from information collected during the first-year studies to be conducted as part of the relicensing process. Craig also outlined "Potential Projects to be addressed in Other Work Groups". He stated that the Interim Projects Task Force is looking for a recommendation by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group that these items be forwarded on to other Work Groups. He added that many of these projects involve land acquisitions and would be better addressed by the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group. One participant suggested that the projects should not be passed to other Work Groups, but rather the responsibility should be shared between Work Groups. Dale Hoffman-Floerke responded that there clearly is a joint duty between Work Groups to determine the best course of action on these projects. Several participants stated that the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group would need to take an active, supporting role and be a strong advocate for their projects. The Facilitator suggested the title of these projects be changed to "Potential Projects to be Addressed Jointly with Other Work Groups."

One participant asked if there was a reason to pass the property acquisition projects on to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group. Craig Jones responded that it seems appropriate that the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group coordinate land acquisition issues.

Several participants suggested that the recommendations to the Plenary Group not include the cost estimates since they are acknowledged to be inaccurate and may unfairly bias opinion. Craig Jones responded that the Interim Projects Task Force did not use cost estimates as criteria when they prioritized the projects because they understood how inaccurate their estimates were in many cases.

One participant commended DWR and the State Water Contractors for helping to move the Interim Projects along and recognized their efforts were done in the spirit of goodwill and to gain community confidence.

Craig Jones, representing the State Water Contractors, said they would like to incorporate the Interim Projects list into the current funding arrangement by which DWR is allotted a certain dollar amount a year for improving recreational facilities around the lake. He added that the State Water Contractors would like to see a 'box' around the list and not consider further additions after recommendations are made to the Plenary Group. One participant stated that he did not feel comfortable with relying on the DWR's current annual budget for recreation projects and requested additional money be given up-front specifically for Interim Projects. Craig Jones responded that DWR has invested a reasonable amount of money in recreational improvements over the past several years. He added that the State Water Contractors would be comfortable with DWR continuing their budget for recreation projects versus reducing their expenditures in the interim years. Tom Glover of DWR stated that over the past seven or eight years, DWR has increased its spending on recreation projects. He agreed to a request to provide the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group with documentation of DWR recreation expenditures at Oroville for the past seven years.

Tom reminded the group that although a project is on the Interim Projects list, it does not mean it will be completed in the interim period before a new license is granted. Several participants recommended that DWR proceed first with projects that would give them "the biggest bang for their buck." The Facilitator informed the participants that the Plenary Group had discussed the process

for how approval and construction of Interim Projects will be handled by DWR. One participant expressed that there is a reasonable level of expectation from the community that DWR make every effort to complete these Interim Projects. He asked, and a member of DWR staff confirmed, that any project on the Interim Projects list that is not completed by 2005 could be completed as part of the final settlement agreement. Harry Williamson of the National Park Service reminded the group that Interim Projects could be at the expense of projects identified through the needs assessment phase of the relicensing effort. He added that any resources committed to Interim Projects would be deducted from the amount that is eventually provided to recreation projects in the settlement agreement.

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to the following statement suggested by Patricia Watters: "The Recreation and Socioeconomic Work Group refers the Interim Projects Task Force Recommendations, without capital cost estimates, to the Plenary Group for its consideration, consensus, and subsequent referral to DWR for implementation. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group further recommends that DWR develop a work plan to implement interim projects and report that work plan to the Plenary Group and Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group within approximately one month of the Plenary Group's action." The Facilitator informed the group that the 'within approximately one month' requirement may be in conflict with the Plenary-approved Interim Project decision-making process that allows DWR until January to respond to the Plenary Group's recommendation. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed that the clock starts with DWR's deadline to the Plenary Group.

Steve Nachtman requested that any edits or comments (excluding those on project costs) be submitted by e-mail to Dale Hoffman-Floerke (dalehf@water.ca.gov), or hardcopy to Doug Rischbieter, John Bass, or himself by 4:00 p.m. Tuesday, October 30.

### **Study Plan Task Force Update**

Doug Rischbieter distributed and briefly reviewed a Recreation and Socioeconomic Study Plans Preliminary Schedule and a Preliminary Draft of Proposed Recreation and Socioeconomic Studies; these documents are appended to this summary as attachments 5 and 6, respectively. Reporting on progress of the Study Plan Task Force, Doug stated that information needs were assembled into the appropriate study that would address that particular need. He added that in many cases, the Task Force is identifying a single study that would address more than one information need. Doug stated that the Study Plan Task Force has already developed drafts of five plans (for Study Plans 7,9,13,18,19) and intends to complete the next fourteen plans within the next four weeks.

Doug explained that each of the study plans would incorporate the following elements:

- Introduction
- Objectives and information needs
- Explanation of the relationship of the study to the relicensing process and how the study meets DWR's obligations to FERC
- Study area
- Methodology for collecting and analyzing information
- Timeline for data collection
- Results and products of the studies
- Study plan coordination with other Work Groups

Doug requested that the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group postpone their November 29 Work Group meeting until December 6 to allow the Study Plan Task Force to complete the plans. The Study Plan Task Force will distribute the final draft of the study plans to the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group participants on November 29 for review and discussion at the December 6 Work Group meeting where the goal is to achieve consensus for a Study Plan

package recommendation to the December 11 Plenary Group meeting. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to meet from 6:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. on December 6, 2001.

Patricia Watters requested the following correction be made to the title of Study Plan 19: "Fiscal Study - effects on government expenditures and government revenues".

Steve Nachtman with the consultant team stated that they intend to provide the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group with a conceptual model/schematic of the linkages between the study plans. The schematic will help participants better understand how information will flow from one study plan to another and help them better conceptualize the overall process.

Mike Pierce of Butte County requested that S3 remain on the list and be addressed in a study plan. He explained that a letter written by Roger Masuda representing Butte County identified S3 as a critical issue to the County. Mike said that although S3 was not in the issue statements approved by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group recommendation to the Plenary Group, it did get included in Scoping Document 1 (SD1). He stated, however, that in SD1 S3 reads, "What are the socioeconomic impacts of the Oroville Facilities and their operation on local governments, residents, agriculture, businesses, and other interests within Butte County"; the County requested this statement read, "Determine the past, existing, and projected future socioeconomic impacts of the Oroville Facilities and their operation on Butte County and any unrealized socioeconomic benefits and opportunities." Mike requested approval by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group to include S3 in the study plan.

Patricia Watters was concerned that S3 was not discussed by the Work Group, but recognized that since S3 is in SD1, the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group should reconsider the issue. Steve Nachtman suggested that Tom Wegge speak to Roger Masuda about incorporation of S3 within the existing economic study plans.

Harry Williamson commended the Study Plan Task Force for putting together the study plans. Harry also recommended that Recreation and Socioeconomic Work Group members address any questions about the methodology or other specifics in the study plans directly with the consultants as soon as possible after the study plan package is distributed on November 28 and before the December 6 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting.

### **Next Meeting**

The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to meet on:

Date: Thursday, December 6, 2001  
Time: 6:00 PM to 10:00 PM  
Location: To be determined.

### **Agreements Made**

1. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to refer the Interim Projects Task Force Recommendations, without capital cost estimates, to the Plenary Group for its consideration, consensus, and subsequent referral to DWR for implementation. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group further agreed to recommend that DWR develop a work plan to implement approved Interim Projects and report that work plan to the Plenary Group and Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group within approximately 1 month of the DWR deadline to the Plenary Group described in the Interim Projects DWR Decision-making process approved by the Plenary Group.

2. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group members agreed to get comments on the Interim Projects Task Force Recommendations to Dale by e-mail at [dalehf@water.ca.gov](mailto:dalehf@water.ca.gov) or by hand to Steve Nachtman, John Baas or Doug Rischbieter by 4:00 PM on Tuesday, October 30, 2001.
3. The Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group agreed to re-schedule their November 29<sup>th</sup> meeting to allow the Study Plan Development Task Force to complete its work and meet on Thursday, December 6, 2001 from 6:00 PM to 10:00 PM. Location to be determined.

### **Action Items**

**Action Item #R36:** Provide the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group with documentation of DWR's budget for Oroville recreation projects from the previous seven years.

**Responsible:** DWR staff (Tom Glover)

**Due Date:** December 6, 2001

**Action Item #R37:** Forward the Oroville Facilities Relicensing Interim Recreation Projects Recommendations to Plenary Group with suggested revisions

**Responsible:** DWR staff/Consulting team

**Due Date:** November 1, 2001

### **Carry over Action Items**

**Action Item #R32:** Discuss Issue Statement S2 with Mike Kelley, Butte County and JPA representatives to determine the fate of this Issue Statement.

**Responsible:** DWR staff/Mike Kelley/Mike Pierce

**Due Date:** TBD